IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION

REENA S. MATHEW,	§	
Plaintiff	§	
	§	
v.	§	Civil Action No. 3:23-cv-01494-N
	§	
SANTANDER CONSUMER USA INC.,	§	
Defendant	§	

APPENDIX OF SUPPLEMENTAL PAGES IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO RECONSIDER PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Pages Description

2-13 Excerpts from the deposition of Reena S. Mathew

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Donald E. Uloth

Donald E. Uloth

Texas Bar No. 20374200

Law Office of Donald E. Uloth

18208 Preston Road, Suite D-9 # 261

Dallas, Texas 75252 Phone: (214) 989-4396

Fax: (972) 777-6951

Email: don.uloth@uloth.pro

Counsel for Plaintiff

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on February 14, 2025 I am filing this motion electronically using the Court's ECF filing system, which will email a file-marked copy of this motion to all counsel of record.

/s/ Donald E. Uloth Donald E. Uloth

Page 1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION REENA S. MATHEW, Plaintiff,) CIVIL ACTION VS.) NO. 3:23-CV-01494-N SANTANDER CONSUMER USA INC., Defendant. ORAL AND VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF REENA S. MATHEW AUGUST 8, 2024

ORIGINAL

ORAL AND VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF REENA S. MATHER produced as a witness at the instance of the Defendant, and duly sworn, was taken in the above-styled and numbered cause on August 8, 2024, from 9:36 a.m. to 5:48 p.m., before Nita G. Cullen, CSR in and for the State of Texas, reported by machine shorthand, at the law offices of Hallett & Perrin, P.C., 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 2400, in the City of Dallas, County of Dallas, State of Texas, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

```
Page 5
1
                       PROCEEDINGS
2
                   VIDEOGRAPHER: All right. We are now on
3
                  Today's date is August the 8th, 2024, and
    the record.
    the time on the video monitor is 9:36 a.m. This is the
4
5
    videotaped deposition of Reena Mathew in the action
    titled Reena Mathew versus Santander Consumer USA Inc.
6
     for the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of
8
    Texas, Dallas Division.
                   Counsel may identify themselves at this
9
    time; afterwards, the Court Reporter will swear in the
10
11
    witness.
12
                   MR. HURST: Monte Hurst for Defendant,
13
     Santander Consumer USA.
14
                   MR. ULOTH: Don Uloth for the Plaintiff,
15
    Reena Mathew.
16
                         REENA S. MATHEW,
    having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:
17
18
                            EXAMINATION
    BY MR. HURST:
19
20
              Can you please state your full name?
21
             Reena Sara Mathew.
          Α.
22
             Is that "Sara" with an "H"?
         Q.
             No "H". S-A-R-A.
23
         Α.
24
             Thank you.
          Q.
25
          Α.
              Yes.
```

- 1 which you're aware in this lawsuit.
- A. Can you say those one more time, please?
- 3 Q. Sure. Pregnancy discrimination.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. And retaliation based on your engaging in
- 6 protected activity of opposing practices discriminating
- 7 against you.
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Based on your pregnancy.
- 10 A. Correct, yes.
- 11 Q. Those are the only legal claims that you're
- 12 asserting in this case, correct?
- 13 A. Protected-wise, yes.
- 14 Q. I didn't understand your answer.
- 15 A. Well, I do believe it was a wrongful
- 16 termination, but protected-wise, yes, that's not
- 17 protected.
- 18 Q. Okay. I am sure that we have talked about some
- or most of this in some form or fashion, but I'm giving
- 20 you an opportunity to tell me each instance you believe
- 21 you were discriminated against based on your pregnancy.
- MR. ULOTH: Objection to the form.
- Q. (By Mr. Hurst) For example, if I may, one
- 24 instance or item is that you believe that Yessica Perez
- 25 wrote you up and made up all these things that you were

- 1 doing wrong only after she learned that you were
- 2 pregnant.
- A. Yes.
- Q. That is, would you agree with me, one way that
- 5 you believe that you were discriminated against because
- 6 of your pregnancy.
- 7 A. Yes.
- Q. And we'll call it the PIP, and you believe that
- 9 she did this PIP, issued on December 1st, 2015, for no
- 10 reason other than learning that you were pregnant.
- 11 A. Correct. And, again, I think I've mentioned it
- 12 before, and I don't even think in my career, I've never
- 13 had any disciplinary action, not even a coaching. So,
- 14 yes, I do believe it.
- Q. Well, let's talk about your career. You worked
- 16 at Neiman's before Santander.
- 17 A. Uh-huh.
- 18 Q. Right?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. You remember when?
- 21 A. 2003 to 2009.
- 22 Q. Okay. And then, where did you work before
- 23 Neiman's?
- A. Before Neiman's? College and grad school, and
- 25 so after that, I did an internship. I had one year of

- A. Major mistakes? No. Mistake? I can't think
- of any now, I'm sure there were plenty of small ones
- 3 along the way, but nothing to warrant coaching or
- 4 disciplinary action.
- 5 Q. Nothing that you can even think of at this time
- 6 regardless of how big or small, right?
- 7 A. That's not what I'm saying.
- 8 Q. What are you saying?
- 9 A. What I'm saying is, if it's something that
- 10 warrants coaching, I've never made that kind of mistake.
- 11 Q. I'm not even using the word "coaching", because
- 12 you wanted to split hairs about that. What I'm trying
- 13 to say is, can you remember any instance where you've
- 14 made a mistake, a big one or a small one, in your work
- 15 history?
- A. Not that I can remember. I'm very particular
- 17 about the way I work. No.
- 18 Q. Thank you. So, we've talked about the first
- instance or one of the instances where you believe you
- were subjected to pregnancy discrimination is when
- 21 Yessica made up all these things to put in a Performance
- 22 Improvement Plan that was issued to you on December 1st.
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. That was as a result of pregnancy
- 25 discrimination.

- 1 A. Yes.
- Q. What else do you believe is evidence or is an
- 3 instance of your being discriminated against because of
- 4 your pregnancy?
- 5 MR. ULOTH: I'll object to the part of the
- 6 question that calls for evidence, but the way it was
- 7 asked, I think you can go ahead and answer it, to the
- 8 extent you can.
- 9 MR. HURST: Well, that's all right. I
- 10 don't want you to not like my question.
- 11 Q. (By Mr. Hurst) Name me, please, another
- 12 instance in which you believe you were subjected to
- 13 pregnancy discrimination.
- 14 A. The second PIP. That's not the process of
- 15 Santander.
- 16 Q. Okay.
- 17 A. We've never had back to back PIPs, and that is
- 18 why I say, when I go a whole month without any coaching
- 19 for a 30-day PIP, and then you turn around and put me on
- another one, that's discriminatory to me because that is
- 21 not the process there.
- Q. Okay. So you're on your first PIP, December 1.
- 23 A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And it's supposed to go for how long?
- A. December 30th, end of the month.

- 1 Q. And when was your second PIP issued?
- 2 A. January 16th -- or 15th. 15th or 16th.
- Q. Now, wasn't the first PIP issued, and you
- 4 complained that 30 days wasn't enough?
- 5 A. Absolutely not. Made up.
- Q. Okay. But you did see that written somewhere,
- 7 it was just something that Yessica or somebody else made
- 8 up.
- 9 A. Say that one more time.
- 10 Q. You did see it was written that 30 days wasn't
- 11 going to be enough.
- 12 A. I -- who would want a longer PIP? Why would
- 13 anyone complain about that? That's ridiculous.
- Q. To give you more time to --
- 15 A. No. People are trying to get off of PIP, not
- 16 stay on one.
- 17 Q. You did not ask for more time, then.
- 18 A. Absolutely, categorically, no.
- 19 Q. Is it your understanding that you finished out
- 20 the first PIP without any incident?
- 21 A. Yes. Because we had no coachings.
- 22 Q. Okay.
- A. And there's no documentation.
- Q. So, you finish out your first PIP, then Yessica
- 25 writes you up on a second PIP.

- 1 Q. You remember the name of the person?
- A. It was a guy. Started with a "D". I can see
- 3 his face.
- Q. Don. No, I'm just kidding.
- 5 A. No. No. Not -- there was so much turnover,
- 6 that's my point, it was hard to keep up.
- 7 Q. Do you know what the paperwork was like on that
- 8 particular case?
- 9 A. No, it was at NRH, no.
- 10 Q. So you have never handled a termination or a
- 11 disciplinary action with regard to an HRBP at Santander?
- 12 A. No.
- 13 Q. I have in my outline to ask you about each
- 14 instance in which you believe you were retaliated
- 15 against. I think we can streamline this process by
- 16 saying, ever since you complained about your not liking
- 17 being discriminated against based on your pregnancy,
- 18 every one of those things that you named before, that
- 19 happened subsequent to the complaint.
- 20 A. Uh-huh.
- 21 Q. Fair?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. And those would be each and every instance of
- 24 retaliation, up to and including the termination.
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. When is it that you complained that you thought
- 2 you were being picked on because you were pregnant?
- A. I believe it was January. Well, I take that
- 4 back. After the PIP. So, right after the PIP, I -- you
- 5 know, that's when I escalated it to Stephanie and, yeah,
- 6 I would say -- I guess early December.
- 7 Q. You said, hey, is this because I'm pregnant?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Or hey, I think this is because I'm pregnant.
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And everything from that point forward --
- 12 A. That's what I truly believe, because when I say
- 13 I was blind-sided, I couldn't have been more blind-
- 14 sided. And when I say I've never had a DA disciplinary
- 15 action, coaching, none of that, never had it, nothing in
- 16 my file, nothing. So when -- a person is truly
- 17 blind-sided without any of that.
- 18 Q. When did you communicate your opposition to
- 19 this?
- A. Opposition -- I'm sorry. To the PIP?
- Q. Yes. Under -- when did you say, hey, I think
- 22 this is because of my pregnancy?
- 23 A. Days after. So if she did that December 1st,
- 24 December 2nd or the 3rd.
- Q. Who did you say it to?

- 1 A. Stephanie. I sent her an e-mail.
- Q. And did Stephanie dignify it? Did she say,
- 3 hey, no, it's not because of that?
- A. She responded, and then, you know, again spoke
- 5 to Yessica, and I think, based on what Yessica said, you
- 6 know, I'm not sure -- I can't speak for her of if she
- 7 looked into it or not, but she certainly went by
- 8 Yessica's word.
- 9 Q. Okay. Have you told me as best as you could
- 10 about all of the reasons why you believe you were
- 11 discriminated against because of your pregnancy and
- 12 retaliated against?
- 13 A. Yes. I'm trying to make sure I didn't forget
- 14 anything, but I believe so, yes.
- 15 Q. Do you believe that any other Santander
- 16 employee was discriminated against because of her
- 17 pregnancy?
- 18 A. Not that I know of.
- 19 Q. Do you believe that there is anyone at
- 20 Santander who feels that she was mistreated because of
- 21 her pregnancy, other than you?
- A. No. Not that I'm aware of, no.
- Q. The people, person who you feel discriminated
- 24 against you because of your pregnancy is Yessica.
- 25 A. Ultimately, yes.

```
Page 301
1
                IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
 2
                           DALLAS DIVISION
     REENA S. MATHEW,
          Plaintiff,
 5
     VS.
                                   ) CIVIL ACTION
 6
     SANTANDER CONSUMER USA
                                   ) NO. 3:23-CV-01494-N
     INC.,
 7
          Defendant.
 9
10
                      DEPOSITION CERTIFICATE
11
12
                           REENA S. MATHEW
                          AUGUST 8, 2024
13
14
15
16
                   I, Nita G. Cullen, Certified Shorthand
17
     Reporter in and for the State of Texas, hereby certify
18
     to the following:
19
                        That the witness, REENA S. MATHEW, was
     duly sworn by the officer and that the transcript of the
20
     oral deposition is a true record of the testimony given
21
22
     by the witness;
23
                   I further certify that pursuant to FRCP
24
     Rule 30(f)(1) that the signature of the deponent:
25
                    was requested by the deponent or a
```

Page	302
1	party before the completion of the deposition and is to
2	be returned within 30 days from date of receipt of the
3	transcript. If returned, the attached Changes and
4	Signature Page contains any changes and the reasons
5	therefor;
6	was not requested by the deponent or a
7	party before the completion of the deposition.
8	I further certify that I am neither
9	attorney or counsel for, nor related to or employed by,
10	any of the parties or attorneys to the action in which
11	this deposition was taken. Further, I am not a relative
12	or employee of any attorney of record in this case, nor
13	am I financially interested in the outcome of the
14	action.
15	Subscribed and sworn to on this 12th day of
16	August, 2024.
17	S. NOTCA
18	ang chi
19	Mita G. Culler Monage
20	NITA G. CULLEN, Texas CSR #1563 Expiration Date: 08-31-2024
21	BRADFORD COURT REPORTING, L.L.C. Firm Registration No. 38
22	7015 Mumford Street Dallas, Texas 75252
23	(214) 931-2799
24	
25	